the gradual institutionalization of democratic practices and liberties. The new pessimists criticize the simplistic view that elections are sufficient to make a country free. But they commit the same fallacy, failing to recognize that democratization is a process of transition, not an instant transformation to a new order.

The new pessimists seem inclined to rush to the judgment that elections are the primary cause of the problems besetting the new democracies, and to believe that the holding of all those elections is a product of U.S. policy. Both these propositions are false.

The problem with elections, it is said, is that they empower majorities that may favor policies motivated by ethnic or religious intolerance or by short-term economic interests. This is a danger, but what is the alternative? The critics tend to suggest some version of what might be called ''liberal nondemocracy''—an unelected government that preserves political stability, promotes economic development, observes the rule of law and generally respects the rights of its subjects.

In theory such a benevolently authoritarian government might be preferable to a corrupt and illiberal democracy. But where can we find one in the real world? The critics cite very few contemporary examples. Mr. Kaplan lavishes praise on the temporary, technocratic government of Pakistan's appointed premier Moeen Qureshi, named to the post after the army forced out his elected predecessor in 1993. Mr. Qureshi served for just three months—hardly a model for long-term stability or widespread emulation. Mr. Zakaria's prime examples are 19th-century European constitutional monarchies that restricted suffrage and Hong Kong under British rule—not exactly a practical vision as we look toward the 21st century.

Proponents of liberal nondemocracy fail to recognize that there is a reason why electoral democracy and liberalism, though sometimes at odds, usually tend to be found together. Liberalism derives from the view that individuals are by nature free and equal, and thus that they can be legitimately governed only on the basis of consent. The historical working-out of this principle inevitably ''democratized'' Europe's constitutional monarchies, just as it later undermined colonialism. Even if ''first liberalism, then democracy'' were the preferred historical sequence, today a nondemocratic government would be hard put to find a solid basis for its ligitimacy—and thus also for its stability—while it goes about the task of liberalization.

Moreover, the new pessimists overlook the close connection between elections and rights. Elections, if they are to be free and fair, require the observance of a substantial body of rights—freedom of association and expression, for example, and equal access to the media. The pessimists fear that elections will undermine rights by legitimizing illiberal regimes. But elections, if they are truly competitive, tend to arouse citizens to insist upon their rights and upon the accountability of elected officials. The process makes government more subject to public scrutiny.

The spread of democracy abroad is the result not of American policy or propaganda, but of demands by peoples worldwide. Whether this demand springs from human nature or from global communications and the unparalleled current prestige of democracy, people almost everywhere want to have a say about who their rulers are. On what basis shall we deny them? Mr. Kaplan suggests that electoral democracy is somehow responsible for the problems of places like Russia, Afghanistan and Africa today. This is plainly absurd. If democracy is the problem, why wasn't Africa flourishing during the 1970s and 1980s, when the continent had but a handful of democracies?

ELECTIONS ARE NOT ENOUGH

None of this is meant to deny the important—though hardly unfamiliar—insight that elections are not enough. Many of the new democracies have performed poorly with respect to accountability, the rule of law and the protection of individual rights. Helping electoral democracies become liberal democracies is certainly in the interests both of the U.S. and of the countries that we assist.

But we are more likely to provide such assistance if we view elections as an opportunity to work for the expansion of rights, rather than an obstacle to it. As countries lacking the usual prerequisites attempt to liberalize and improve their democracies, it would be foolish not to expect serious problems. But it would be even greater folly to believe that authoritarianism is the solution.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM RUSSELL KELLY, FOUNDER OF KELLY SERVICES

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1998

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Mr. William Russell Kelly, founder of Russell Kelly Office Service, and founder of this modern temporary help industry. Mr. Kelly died Saturday, January 3 at his home in Ft. Lauderdale, Florida. He was 92.

In 1946, single-handedly, Russ Kelly founded a new industry in a Detroit storefront. It began as an accommodation to employers to fill in for vacationing or sick employees, and also to supplement regular staff during short-term workloads. In the early days most of the temporary employees were women secretaries, hence the name ''Kelly Girls'' soon became a trademark around the world. Society has moved far beyond this confined role for women and so has the company; today, tens of thousands of professional and technical women and men have joined others in Kelly Services.

Beginning as a fledgling company totaling $848.00 in sales in its first year, Kelly Services has grown today to a Fortune 500 and a Forbes 500 company, with annual sales approaching $4 billion. Annually, this Troy, Michigan-based company provides the services of more than 750,000 of its employees through more than 1500 company offices in 50 states and 16 countries.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the ingenuity and the memory of this entrepreneurial pioneer. Indeed, when Russ Kelly was asked how he wanted to be remembered, he said, ''Only as a pioneer.''

I extend my sincere sympathy to Russell Kelly's wife, Margaret, his son, Terence E. Adderley, who joined the company in 1958 and became its President in 1967 and who has now succeeded Mr. Kelly as Chairman of the Board of the Company, his daughter-in-law, Mary Beth and his six grandchildren, and three great-grandchildren.

A TRIBUTE TO DAVE MOORE

HON. JIM RAMSTAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1998

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a true pioneer in broadcasting and television journalism.

These are very sad days in Minnesota, as a true legend has passed from our midst. No one who has called Minnesota home for the past half century will ever forget Dave Moore of WCCO Television in Minneapolis, who died on Wednesday, January 28, 1998.

Dave Moore was much, much more than a television news anchor. His standard-setting ethics, keen wit, astute observations, lyrical prose, sheer longevity, inspiring work ethic and unique, curmudgeonly demeanor helped to define Minnesota for all of us who absolutely had to be home for the 6 and 10 p.m. news. His background in theater gave him a special talent few of today's journalists possess: the ability to touch viewers by conveying his feelings.

Mr. Speaker, Dave was a humble man, full of self-effacing humor, never one to overrate his importance in our lives. ''I am a very lucky guy . . . I have one marketable talent,'' he once said, ''reading out loud.''

For 47 wonderful years on Channel 4, WCCO–TV, Dave gave us the news. On newscasts from 1957 until 1991, he was there every day.

Late on Saturday nights, you were absolutely un-Minnesotan if you weren't home for Moore's late-night ''The Bedtime Nooz,'' a show full of cutting-edge humor that poked fun at current events and politicians.

An outsider trying to gauge Dave Moore's significance to Minnesotans needed only look at the front pages of newspapers last week. The tributes to Dave Moore have been poignant and powerful: grown people searching and yanking deep to pull up childhood memories—and producing tears mixed with laughter in our newspapers and on broadcasts across the dial.

Mr. Speaker, if you went back to just about any day—from television news' infancy in the 1950s to its slick, digitalized, distant relative here in the 1990s—you would find Moore dominating conversations, too. You would hear at lunch counters the ubiquitous query: ''Did you hear what Dave said last night on the news?''

The Star Tribune wrote that, with Moore, it was ''not a question of credibility, or expertise, or looks—certainly not looks. It's simply that Moore had a presence that inspired calm, trust and good will.'' The Pioneer Press said Dave Moore ''was a kind of Midwestern comfort food—the meatloaf and mashed potatoes of broadcast . . . the heart behind the headlines.''

Dave Moore was anything but slick, and that's why we loved him so much. He was trust personified, substance over style. His credibility was beyond reproach. But if you saw him at one of his favorite places out in public—a play, baseball game, movie—he was easily approachable. His diverse and widespread charitable efforts were inspiring. A truly fitting favorite was reading the newspaper to the blind.

This week, a Vietnam veteran called a radio station to pay his tribute to Dave Moore. This